

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 9, 2003, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by July 9, 2003.

Claims 15-28 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the numbering of the claims was objected to as not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126, and misnumbered claims 1-14 were renumbered as claims 15-28. Claims 15-16, 18-20, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,918,360 to Forbes et al in view of EP 966156 to Smith et al. Claims 15, 18-20, and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,827,141 to Hallerback in Smith.

The Applicants note with appreciation the indicated allowance of claims 17 and 21-24, if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to the allowance of claims 17 and 21-24, however, the Applicant notes that in the Office Action, no grounds for rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, were stated. Thus, the Applicant assumes that claims 17 and 21-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to adopt the new claim numbering.

In this amendment, claims 15-28 were amended to address the renumbering of the claims issue by changing claim dependencies.

In light of the allowance of claims 17 and 21-24, new claim 29 was added, which combines claim 15 with allowable claim 17.

Looking now at the substantive rejection of claims 15-16, 18-20, and 28, the Applicant has amended claim 15 to more clearly distinguish the present invention over the cited reference combinations. Specifically, claim 15 now includes the limitations of claim 16, which has been canceled, and the additional feature that the core ring 70 is made of plastic. The Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 15 is not rendered obvious by the cited references, when viewed in the proposed combinations.

The reference to Forbes teaches attaching a stator tooth 187 onto a metal ring 181 (see the figure on the first page of the patent). Smith teaches a shield or barrier 24 of polypropylene which lines the encapsulated stator core 20. If the practitioner were to combine the Forbes and Smith references as proposed, he or she would place a shield or barrier of polypropylene on Forbes' metal core ring 181. However, this structure still does not provide a core ring made of plastic, forming a watertight channel and holding together at least one stack of individual laminations, and in which the core ring has at least one hook-shaped projection – also made of plastic – for each stack of individual laminations, as defined in amended claim 15 of the present application.


Likewise, the combination of the Hallerback and Smith patents fails to show or suggest to the practitioner using a core ring with at least one hook-shaped projection.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 as amended is patentable over the cited reference combinations, along with dependent claims 18-28 and new claim 29. The Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

In light of the foregoing arguments in support of patentability, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700